

REMARKS

Claim 7 has been amended to add a comma at line 4. Claims 6, 9, and 18 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-17, and 19 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested in view of the following remarks.

In response to Section 1 of the Office Action, a terminal disclaimer fee of \$65.00 is enclosed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner accept and enter the terminal disclaimer filed June 6, 2005. As a result of such entry, Applicant submits that the double patenting rejections at Section 2 of the Office Action are overcome, and claims 1-4 are believed to be allowable, as indicated at Section 11 of the Office Action.

Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 6 (which is cancelled herein). Thus, the § 102 rejections at Sections 5 and 6 of the Office Action are no longer applicable. Accordingly, claims 5 and 8 (which depends from claim 5) are believed to be allowable, as indicated at Section 11 of the Office Action.

Objected to claims 11, 12, and 14 have been amended to include the limitations of base claim 9 (which is cancelled herein), and are therefore believed to be allowable. Claims 10, 13, and 15 have been amended to depend from allowable claim 11, and are therefore also believed to be allowable. Thus, the § 102 rejections of claim 9 at Sections 7 and 8 of the Office Action, and the § 102 rejections of claims 10 and 15 at Section 8 of the Office Action, are no longer applicable.

Claim 16 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 18 (which is cancelled herein). Thus, the § 102 rejections of claim 16 at Sections 7 and 8 of the Office Action are no longer applicable. Claim 19 has been amended to depend

from allowable claim 16. Accordingly, claims 16, 17 (which depends from claim 16), and 19 are believed to be allowable.

Turning to the § 103 rejection of claim 7 at Section 10 of the Office Action, Applicant submits that DE '428 does not teach or suggest a camera crane having a front section pivotable about a first axis and a second axis relative to a first end of a boom arm, as recited in claim 7. Rather, DE '428 discloses a first support platform 27, 28 that is pivotable about a first joint 38 at a first end of a boom arm, and a camera platform that is separately pivotable about a support shaft 29 attached to the support platform 27, 28.

The camera platform cannot properly be construed to pivot about the shaft 29 connected to the support platform 27, 28, and also about an axis (at joint 38) about which the support platform 27, 28 itself pivots. Indeed, the camera platform does not "pivot" about the first end of the boom arm at all. It is only the support platform 27, 28 that pivots about the front end of the boom arm. Furthermore, the support platform 27, 28 is not merely an "intermediate structure," since it is the structure about which the camera platform actually pivots. Neither the first support platform 27, 28, nor the camera platform (nor any other element in DE '428), is pivotable about two separate axes, as is the claimed front section.

Additionally, while DE '782 discloses a counter weight 36, it does not disclose one or more leveling rods linked to a counter weight platform and to a front section of a boom arm, as claimed. Indeed, no leveling rod is attached to the counter weight 36 in DE '782. Furthermore, the counter weight 36 is a longitudinally movable counter weight, not a counterweight platform, as claimed. Thus, several claimed elements are

entirely absent from the DE '428 and DE '782 references, and claim 7 is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is requested.

Dated: Nov. 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 34055
Perkins Coie LLP
Patent - LA
P.O. Box 1208
Seattle, WA 98111-1208
Phone: (310) 788-9900
Fax: (206) 332-7198

PERKINS COIE LLP

By: Kenneth H. Ohriner
Kenneth H. Ohriner
Reg. No. 31,646